extract a still image from video data and further to store the still image in a hard disk in steps 350, 369, 370, 374 and 376. Applicants disagree.

As discussed during the interview, in Fig. 10 of Westland, the video data of Westland is played by VTR (step 344) and a frame of the input video is digitized (step 370) and stored (steps 374 and 376) after auto or manual selection (step 369). That is, the input video stream of Westland is in analog form and requires to be digitized before the data can be stored in memory.

In contrast, the video data of Saunders is a video component stream as shown in Fig. 5 as video 502. If the video 502 is an analog video played by VTR and is different from the original digital video stream of Saunders, the synchronization with banner 504 and slides 506 will not be achieved.

Therefore, the video data of Saunders and Westland cannot be combined because the video data are incompatible to each other. Moreover, Saunders and Westland cannot be combined because the proposed modification would render the prior art (Saunders) unsatisfactory for its intended purpose (i.e., data that is synchronized with banners and slides). See MPEP §2143.01 V.

As also discussed during the interview, Saunders fails to disclose or suggest "an image obtainment unit that obtains extracted static image data associated in advance with the obtained reproduction time position." The Office Action alleges that paragraph [0042], Fig. 5 and paragraph [0044] disclose that media samples corresponds to static image data.

However, media samples cannot be static image data, because media samples are not extracted from video data streams with the reproduction time position, as required in claim 1.

Even if Westland's VTR video is used as the video stream of Saunders, the static image data cannot be extracted at an operator's desired reproduction time position because

Westland collects only two frames, a starting frame 352 and an ending frame 354 of segment (manual shot). See Westland, col. 21, lines 56-68.

Although an amendment regarding synchronization between video stream and the static image was suggested to overcome Westland during the interview, in claim 1, the synchronization is assured by the use of a reproduction time position. This feature is not found in Westland.

Even further, Saunders fails to disclose or suggest "an image reproduction unit that reproduces the obtained static image data synchronously with the video data," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action alleges that Fig. 5 and paragraphs [0051] - [0053] teach that a client accesses a presentation reproduced according to the rendering times set by the user. However, static image data is not disclosed in Fig. 5 and paragraphs [0051] - [0053] in Saunders. Therefore, static image data are not reproduced synchronously with the video data in Saunders.

Independent claims 2 and 4-12 recite similar features to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are patentable over Saunders and Westland. Claims 3 and 13-20 depend from independent claims 1, 4 and 4-12. These claims are patentable over Saunders and Westland for at least the same reason as the corresponding independent claim, as well as for the additional features recited.

Moreover, with respect to dependent claims 13-20, these claims further specify that a retrieval interface includes a keyword input part that matches a keyword with the image data to retrieve results. The Office Action states that Fig. 7B and paragraph [0049] of Saunders implicitly teach retrieval of a presentation file by retrieving a file that matches an input. However, such implicit retrieval does not match keyword content to contents data associated

with the image data to obtain reproduction time positions. Accordingly, dependent claims 13-20 distinguish over Saunders and Westland.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:HXT/amw

Date: May 21, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

> DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
> AUTHORIZATION
> Please grant any extension
> necessary for entry;
> Charge any fee due to our
> Deposit Account No. 15-0461